

- 25 -

**REMARKS**

Applicant notes Examiner's comments and has amended the independent claims to clarify that the information is human readable. It is submitted that this information was implicit in the original claims, since the information was intended to be distinct from the coded data that is also claimed.

Some other minor amendments have been made to rectify some minor typographical errors, including amending claim 177 to remove its dependence on deleted claim 1.

The claimed invention differs from Dymetman in two ways. First, and as described in detail in the previous response, the human readable information and coded data are printed simultaneously in the present invention. Dymetman, in contrast, only contemplates a system in which coded data is preprinted onto paper, which is then supplied to a publisher to add their own information at a later date.

Moreover, by Examiner's admission, Figure 6B of Dymetman discloses two types of information: page location information, which is encoded by way of concentric squares, and page identity information, which is provided in the form of a page identifier located in the centre of the squares. Of these, only the page identifier can anticipate the human readable information requirement of the independent claims, since it is the only information that makes any semantic sense to humans. (as an aside, Applicant submits that even this is not adequately disclosed, since the paragraphs that immediately precede the section describing this confirm the desirability of making the information/coded data invisible.) If the page identifier is the human readable data in the present claims, then the coded data must logically be the squares surrounding the page identifier. However, the only information this coded data encodes is location information. Without the added data in the page identifier, the location identifier is not "indicative of at least one interactive element relating to the computer software", as required by claim 2 of the present invention.

For these reasons, it is submitted that claim 2 as amended is patentable over Dymetman. Similar comments apply in relation to claim 88 and 89.

- 26 -

Applicant submits that the remaining claims are dependent upon allowable base claims and are therefore themselves allowable.

In the event Examiner wishes to maintain a rejection based on Dymetman, it would greatly be appreciated if some guidance as to precisely what aspect of the claims Examiner feels is lacking. Although it is appreciated that Examiners are not in a position to suggest amendments, some ideas as to what specific weaknesses Examiner feels are embodied in the claims would warmly be welcomed by the Applicant.

- 27 -

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,



---

KIA SILVERBROOK



---

PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia  
Email: [Kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:Kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9818 6711